

## REMARKS

Claims 1-4, 7, 8, 10, and 12-16 have been amended, and claim 5 has been canceled. Claims 1-4 and 6-16 are currently pending in the application.

In the specification, the amendments introduced above follow the Examiner's suggestions for typographic corrections. The claim amendments consist of typographic corrections and clarifications to make the claim definite. Basis for these edits are provided in the table below:

Claim(s)	Term/Phrase	Basis
1, 10	"wt%"	Page 11, lines 13-17.
3, 12	"diethylacrylamide"	Page 14, line 12, to page 15, line 2 (Example 4).
4, 13, 14	"weight ratio"	Page 14, line 12, to page 15, line 2 (Example 4).
4, 13, 14	"diethylacrylamide to dimethylacrylamide"	Page 14, line 12, to page 15, line 2 (Example 4); this nomenclature is used synonomously with the alternate nomenclature calling out the substitution site, i.e. "N, N-dimethylacrylamide", see for example the discussion page 8, lines 11-32.
7	"ethyl"	typographic correction
15	"...solution of claim 1 to a..." "channel, replacing"	typographic correction
16	"claim 15"	typographic correction

No new matter has been added by the amendments. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

## Claim Objections

The Examiner objected to claims 7 and 15 for the informalities present therein. The claims have been amended to correct the informalities, and accordingly, Applicants respectfully request these objections be withdrawn.

### **Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 112**

The Examiner rejected claims 1-5, 8, 10, 12-14 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite because of the terms set forth under items a)-t) in paragraph 3 of the Office Action.

Applicants respectfully disagree with this rejection, particularly in view of the amendments that respond to the Examiner's particular concerns under items a)-r) and item t). Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn.

In regard to item s) of paragraph 3, the Examiner also rejected claim 15 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph because an essential step ("coating") is omitted.

Applicants respectfully disagree. The claim recites the use of the polymer solution of claim 1, which is stated to comprise both a sieving and a coating polymer. This usage of the two polymers in combination is noted on page 11, line 30, to page 12, line 2, of the specification. Further, it is noted that "Alternatively and preferably, one may combine the two polymers [sieving and coating polymers] and coat the channel simultaneously...", page 12, lines 3-16. It is this method that is the subject of claim 15, and thus the "replacing" step, wherein the polymer solution of claim 1 is being reintroduced into the channel, will serve to both coat the channel and replenish the sieving polymer. Accordingly, Applicants submit that recitation of an additional coating step is unnecessary.

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn.

For the above reasons, Applicants submit that any basis for objection or rejection of the pending claims has been overcome and respectfully request that it be withdrawn, and that the claims, indicated to be allowable, be quickly passed to issue.

Respectfully submitted,



Stephen C. Macevicz  
Reg. No. 30,285  
Attorney for Applicants

Telephone: (650) 210-1223  
Email: smacevicz@aclara.com

Attached: Petition for Time Extension